

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **February 14, 2003** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-36. Claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-28 and 31-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,223,212 to Batty. Claims 5-7, 17-18, and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batty in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,227 to Edlund.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 due to insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the pre-specified list of safe commands” in line 2. Claim 30 incorrectly relies upon independent claim 25 instead of upon dependent claim 29 which includes the limitation “a pre-specified list of safe commands.” Claim 30 has been modified to rely upon dependent claim 29.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Batty. Applicant respectfully submits that while Batty teaches use of a filtering mechanism to manage the right to provide input to the local workstation (managing the right to provide input to hosted and/or shadowed windows, col. 18, lines 64-65), Batty teaches that the filtering method has only two modes, detached and cooperating (col. 18, lines 66-67). In detached mode, an ASCE (Application Sharing Conference Entity, similar to a remote user) has the right to provide input to hosted windows and does not have the right to provide input to shared windows (col. 19, lines 1-3). In cooperating mode, cooperating ASCEs within the conference serially acquire the right to provide input to hosted and shadowed windows (col. 19, lines 8-10). Hence, permission to execute commands on the local computer system in the invention taught by Batty are granted on a **per-user basis**. Depending on the mode, the remote user either does or does not have the right to execute commands on the local computer system.

In contrast, the present invention teaches receiving a command at the local computer system and passing the command through a filtering process (page 3, lines 8-10). Access to run the command on the local computer system is determined on a **per-command basis** and not on a per-user basis, as is taught by Batty. In the present invention, a remote user may be allowed to run some commands on the local computer system, while other commands maybe disallowed. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify this point. Support for this amendment can be found on page 3, lines 8-10.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-24, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-36, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



A. Richard Park
Registration No. 41,241

Date: May 1, 2003

A. Richard Park
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1661
FAX: (530) 759-1665